United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONED FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1950
Alexandral Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/838,436	04/19/2001	Istvan Cseri	MSFT-0323/167389.1	2254	
41505 7590 04/19/2007 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR			EXAMINER		
			POLLACK, MELVIN H		
2929 ARCH S PHILADELPH	TREET IIA, PA 19104-2891	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	,		2145		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/19/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)	
09/838,436	CSERI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit	Art Unit	
Melvin H. Pollack	2145	2145	•

	Melvin H. Pollack	2145	,				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 09 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A		in the final rejection, wh	ichever is later. In				
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	06.07(f).						
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
·	lianaa with 27 CED 44 27 must ba	Elad odala ta					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since				
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	2001100				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NO	TE below);	ecause				
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better		ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11							
1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment ((PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 			_				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil ided below or appended.	I be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-28 and 30-38. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	before or on the date of filing a No sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a).				
IO. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
1. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowar	ce because:				
2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
3. Other:	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •						
	_	MHP					
	4	110,0	, ,				

The Hole of

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the change in claims to a prior version complicates the issues and significantly changes the scope such that further consideration is required.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of a significant number of errors made in regards to the remarks.

The amendment may be an attempt to supplementally amend the RCE to which a first action final was provided. However, the instant amendment was not timely submitted for such a purpose, nor was it properly written for this purpose. Such an amendment must also be considered bad faith, given its timing and structure.

The declaration is not accepted in part because the affidavit is incomplete and unsigned. While the declaration states that there are three pages, only page one has been received. Pagas 2 and 3 are missing.

The affidavit is also not accepted because it fails to show due dilligence. There is a lack of accounting regarding their actions between the last date of Appendix D (01 August 2000) and the filing date (19 April 2001).

The affidavit is also not accepted because it is not timely. The applicants have failed to explain why they are only now trying to swear behind art that has been applied since a nonfinal action dated September 2004. A new RCE is required for the affidavit to be considered.